

50-4089

CONFIDENTIAL

DEC 3 1956

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director (Support)

25X1A

REFERENCE: Your question on Notice [REDACTED] as follows:  
 "I don't see why this was not caught in June or July and handled without having to republish full text, etc."

See  
DDSS 6-395

1. You asked two questions calling for quite different answers. First, why was that not caught in June or July.

The answer is that RCS has been operating on the basis that the responsibility for spotting the need for possible reissuance of a Notice or continuance of an existing Notice beyond existing expiration date rests with the office of primary concern. In this case, the office of primary concern is the Office of Personnel, and they did not pick up the matter until 15 August 1956, which is 15 days after the expiration date.

Dealing with this aspect alone, it seems to be logical and a part of good service that RCS accept a new responsibility, and that is to notify the office of primary concern as to an expiration date of a Notice 30 days before the expiration date and require an action position ten days before expiration date. (See attached sample memo.) This is now SOP.

2. Your second question having to do with the republishing of full text, in this case, falls into the delay aspect and a security position. Because the expiration date was long gone by, whereby theoretically many people would have pulled out the original Notice and destroyed it, republishing was deemed necessary.

The material in this Notice would normally be issued as a Regulation. However, Security insists on a Notice because a Notice is a device by which such material may be withheld from Congressional scrutiny or inspection when they ask for Regulations on clearances.

Do Change in Class. <input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Declassified	
Class. Changed to: TS S <b>C</b>	
Next Review Date: <b>1989</b>	
Auth: HR 79-3	
Date: <b>8 JAN 1978</b>	By: <b>015</b>

[REDACTED]  
 Chief, Management Staff

25X1A9a

1 Attachment